

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/016,823

Applicant(s)

HARRADINE ET AL.

Examiner

NIGAR CHOWDHURY

Art Unit

2621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NIGAR CHOWDHURY.

(3) Nikolaus P. Schibli

(2) Thai Tran.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 August 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-41, 57-59, 66-68, 72-75, and 79-80

Identification of prior art discussed: Nakatani et al and Levine.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

If adding "camera" to independent claims, the claimed invention would overcome the applied references.

THAI TRAN
SPE, A.U. 2621,